

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/625,398	07/23/2003	Roger Bourassa	9093		
. 7590 08/19/2004			EXAM	EXAMINER	
Gilles Boulanger			YEUNG, JAMES C		
#106 2100 Memphre club			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
Magog, QC J1X 5X4			3749		
CANADA			DATE MAILED: 08/19/2004		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/625,398	BOURASSA ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	James C Yeung	3749			
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply if NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period we Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	66(a). In no event, however, may a reply be time within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days rill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONEI	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 Ju	<u>ıly 2003</u> .				
2a) This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) ⊠ This	action is non-final.	·			
Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims					
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray 5) ☐ Claim(s) 7 is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-6 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or					
Application Papers					
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine					
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.					
Applicant may not request that any objection to the					
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
<ul> <li>12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign</li> <li>a) All b) Some * c) None of:</li> <li>1. Certified copies of the priority documents</li> <li>2. Certified copies of the priority documents</li> <li>3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents</li> <li>* See the attached detailed Office action for a list</li> </ul>	s have been received. s have been received in Applicati nty documents have been receive u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	ion No ed in this National Stage			
Attachment(s)  1) Motice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) ☐ Interview Summary	· (PTO-413)			
2) Notice of References Cited (PTO-992)  Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  Paper No(s)/Mail Date	Paper No(s)/Mail D				

Application/Control Number: 10/625,398

Art Unit: 3749

## **DETAILED ACTION**

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 2. Claims 1-2, and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Koch.

  The structure as claimed is fully anticipated by Koch.

In particular, Koch shows in Figs. 1-2 a hood extension (10) to help venting cooking fumes and adapted to fit over an existing range hood (14) comprising: a top planar surface (36), a peripheral flap (48, 46,26) extending from the perimeter of the top planar surface (36); and retainer means (20a-20d) to retain the hood extension (10) over the existing range hood (14).

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Application/Control Number: 10/625,398

Art Unit: 3749

ŝ

4. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Koch.

Koch discloses the invention substantially as claimed. However, Koch does not disclose that the peripheral flap is made of a soft, pliable, curtain like material. However, it is noted that the particular material as claimed is deemed matter of design choice obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made. No patentable weight can be given thereto in the absence of a showing of criticality by applicant.

5. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Koch in view of Dorsey.

Dorsey teaches the use of a foldable smoke shield (note elements 26 and 18, Fig. ) for the purpose of allowing the smoke shield to be folded for easy storage.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the peripheral flap of the hood extension of Koch in the manner as taught by Dorsey in order to allow the peripheral flap to be folded for easy storage.

6. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Koch in view of Schrank.

Schrank teaches the use of rounded corners (note Figs. 2 and 5) for the purpose of avoiding injury to the use.

Application/Control Number: 10/625,398

Art Unit: 3749

ŝ

Page 4

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to provide the hood extension of Koch with rounded corners in the manner

as taught by Schrank in order to avoid injury to the user.

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's

disclosure.

Each of Chang, Jacobs and Yang is cited to show a kitchen hood having an extended

surface.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to James C Yeung whose telephone number is 703 308-1047. The

fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-

872-9306. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

JΥ

August 18, 2004

James C. Yeung Primary Examiner